

STATE OF MONTANA  
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME  
HELENA, MONTANA

## *Office Memorandum*

TO : Wes Woodgerd      Attention: Jim Posewitz      DATE: September 11, 1973  
FROM : Tom Hay      By:      Otis Robbins  
SUBJECT: Proposed Master Plan --- Glacier National Park

The proposed Master Plan of Glacier National Park is, in general, well written; however, several areas of the report are vague.

The stated objective of the master plan is "to maintain esthetic experience and to preserve the resource that makes it possible". Opportunities exist in this report to delineate positive programs that would guarantee this objective, yet the report fails to outline a program that would prevent destruction of the resource. (See No's 1 and 2)

1. Page 5 --- 2nd paragraph. Two potential threats to the environment, native species and esthetic experiences, are completely disposed of in the first sentence. However, the proposed airport receives considerable discussion throughout the plan. Both cloud-seeding and fluoride emissions pose serious threats at the park environment. We believe a thorough discussion of these threats and an action program to eliminate them should be an integral part of the plan.
2. Page 13 --- 1st paragraph. The Act of May 11, 1910 allows the Bureau of Reclamation to enter upon and utilize for flowage park lands and water. Once more a very serious threat is disposed of without any discussion of potential threat to the environment of the park. Potential dam sites exist on the Middle and North Forks of the Flathead that possibly could be used by the Bureau of Reclamation. A full discussion of these very serious threats should be an integral part of the plan.
3. Page 23 --- 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th paragraphs. Page 4 indicates the objective of the fishery resource management plan is to protect the native fishery resource. Planting of various species, both native and non-native, have occurred in the park over at least a sixty year period. I question if there has been any serious gene changes in species during that period. Natural populations already have the necessary genetic diversity to survive. It seems to me this is a long verbal discussion to justify the elimination of stocking with some rather weak excuses. We can concur heartily in the elimination of stocking various species based on the major premise that the native species are to be emphasized in the management program.

In the second paragraph we would suggest changing the wording to read: "About 75 percent of the waters of the park have altered fish populations resulting from fish planting". In the last sentence we submit that exploitation may cause beneficial or harmful natural relationships.

In this same trend in paragraph 5 we believe that if you are going to emphasize native species then perhaps more liberal regulations aimed at non-native species may reduce the populations of competing non-natives with desired native species. Thus increased exploitation of certain species may be very desirable.

4. Page 24 ---- 2nd paragraph. This paragraph seems to be out of place in this report.
5. Page 29 ---- 2nd and 3rd paragraphs. We agree that it is very desirable to protect the goat population that uses this mineral lick. They should be given every protection. The 3rd paragraph indicates that as many as 150 goats have been on the lick at one time. This seems to be a bit much. Goats that could be killed by traffic could create very adverse reaction on the part of the public.

Otis Robbins

OR:rm